

**NORTH COUNTY CORRIDOR
EXPRESSWAY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

ITEM: 6b

SUBJECT:

North County Corridor Delivery Strategies

We continue to struggle with the current strategy of drafting a route adoption document for the NCC to be ITIP eligible, so as to secure CTC programming for up to \$91 million of future ITIP monies. The primary struggle stems from the fact that we cannot meet or properly address Caltrans standards or process requirements. Also challenging is the fact that project details and alignments cannot be discussed to their full extent due to the environmental process required by the route adoption process.

The attached discussion paper (North County Corridor (NCC) Strategies for Capturing the \$91M from ITIP Funding in the 2010 STIP) has evolved over several weeks through meetings and conversations to a recommendation from the Technical Advisory Committee.

The discussion paper is a result of extensive review of the current strategy and its potential for delivering a successful long-range project that will meet the purpose and need for the proposed NCC. The California Transportation Commission Resolution G-08-08 2.8 and 2.9 deleted all programming for the Route 120 Oakdale Bypass in the 2008 STIP and supported the Department of Transportation's commitment to the development and delivery of the North County Corridor project as an alternative to the Route 120 Oakdale Bypass. The Commission acknowledges the Department's (Caltrans) intent to nominate up to \$91M in the 2010 ITIP for programming of an ITIP eligible project segment and to identify an appropriate scope, cost and schedule for programming of a project segment in the 2010 STIP. To make this a reality, the NCC project has been diligently pursuing a state route adoption (to make the project ITIP eligible). This process needs to be complete by the November California Transportation Commission meeting. The immediate next step is to program a buildable segment into the 2010 STIP in March 2010.

Our discussions with Caltrans centers on future commitments that the Authority must determine are to the region's benefit. The Route Adoption Project Report will only discuss the connection points of the NCC to Route 99 and to Route 120 in general terms. It will ASSUME that all design standards will be met. The major design standards that are key to Caltrans from an operational and safety criteria are interchange spacing and connections to State facilities. Caltrans will

designate this as a freeway-to-freeway connection at SR 99. To meet current design standards, freeway-to-freeway interchanges must have 2-mile spacing to the next access point (interchange). Potentially, both Kiernan Road I/C and Main Street I/C in Ripon would have to be eliminated due to the fact that they are less than 2 miles from Hammett I/C. In addition, the Pirrone Road connection could not be built due to its proximity to Hammett I/C.

Caltrans staff is committed to working with us to find a way to make this a viable project. They are willing to permit construction of the NCC as a local roadway until operational and safety impacts require that standards be met. This would allow a connection to SR 99 at Hammett Road and allow local road connections per the Salida Community Plan at Pirrone Road for the time being. The region would have to commit to providing first priority funding to mitigate these impacts using the Stanislaus County's share of federal/state/local transportation funding.

It is worthy to note that the \$91M in ITIP funding is not fully committed. The Kempton letter states that "up to" \$91M could be committed to the project. In addition, consideration must be given to the fact that the ITIP funding would come in small allocations over several STIP cycles. The ratio of the \$91M ITIP funding is 7.5% of the total estimated project costs (NCC PDS Report).

Understanding that it is in the Region's best interest to keep the potential \$91M in ITIP funding local, we began to discuss the feasibility of moving the ITIP funding to SR 132. The constraints to the NCC are resolved and additional benefits could be realized. In addition, there are several advantages to the SR 132. Those are summarized below.

- SR 132 will be more marketable for the \$91M ITIP funding since it already has the majority of the right of way purchased, \$14.4M in earmark and additional funding in the RIP, TCRP and PFF.
- SR 132 Phase 1 will provide immediate relief by connecting Needham Bridge to the SR 132 West. This can be a first phase project for SR 132.
- SR 132 is already a state route and on the interregional highway system; therefore, it is already eligible for the \$91M in ITIP funding.
- Eliminating the ITIP funding on the NCC will allow the project to move forward as a local expressway and could expedite project delivery.
- There is opportunity for the NCC to eventually be transferred to the state once it is built (or possibly, even when phases are built if independent utility and logical termini are met).
- There is no net loss of funding either to the SR 132 project or the NCC project if there is an equal substitution of PFF funding for the ITIP funding.
- By getting the NCC to a constructible phase sooner, it will allow the opportunity seek stimulus or other funding to build the project phases.
- Expedited construction of the NCC will provide air quality benefits by providing earlier congestion relief.

Removing the ITIP funds from the NCC will not result in an appreciable loss of effort. All efforts made to move forward on the traffic, environmental, public scoping could be rolled into the Plan B.

Attached are the following supportive documents:

1. NCC Strategies for capturing the \$91M from ITIP funding in the 2010 STIP
2. CTC Adoption of 2008 STIP Resolution No. G-08-08
3. Letter from Will Kempton, addressed to Supervisor Grover and Mayor Jackson

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

By motion, the NCC TEA Board approves the following recommendations:

1. Recommend to Caltrans that the deprogrammed SR 120 Oakdale Bypass ITIP funding of up to \$91M be nominated to SR 132 and to program a viable project segment into the 2010 STIP. The NCC remains the alternative to the SR 120 Oakdale Bypass without ITIP funding.
2. Contingent on SR132 receiving CTC programming for the \$91M of ITIP funding, recommend to Board of Supervisors and Stan COG Policy Board to re-program \$91M PFF funding from SR132 to Phase 1 NCC, described as the Oakdale Bypass portion.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Plan B can be accomplished within the existing budget and contract with Jacobs Engineering for the development of the NCC. There is no fiscal impact with this action.

North County Corridor (NCC)
Strategies for Capturing the \$91M from ITIP Funding in the 2010 STIP
Discussion DRAFT

Based on the meeting with Caltrans on January 12, 2009, and subsequent strategy meetings with the NCC Project Development Team (PDT-includes all stakeholders, local agencies and Caltrans staff), two strategies (Plan A and Plan B) have been identified in this document. The Caltrans meeting was held at the Caltrans District 10 office, and was attended by Terry Ogle & Anton Kismetian (Central Region – Design), Christina Hibbard (District 10 Project Manager), Matt Machado & Laurie Barton (NCCTEA JPA) and Kris Balaji (Jacobs). The subsequent meetings consist of the PDT meeting at Modesto on January 21st and a teleconference with the PDT members on January 30th.

It is essential that the next NCCTEA Board Meeting agree upon a resolution on the strategy on February 11, 2009.

The intent of these strategies is two fold:

1. To capture the \$91M in Interregional programming and future funding that was committed by Caltrans to the North County Corridor project in the 2010 STIP. Acknowledgement is made that the \$91M would be expected over many STIP cycles in relatively small increments.
2. To enable the NCC project and any other projects currently in progress to proceed without design constraints regarding future standards (primarily freeway-to-freeway connection and interchange spacing)

Plan A

This plan calls for proceeding with the North County Corridor as a State Route built as an expressway with connection to State Route 99 on the west and SR120 on the east. This plan would require completing a CEQA document and a modified Project Report to enable CTC Route Adoption at its November 2009 meeting, followed immediately by an Interregional designation through legislation. There will also be a Project Study Report prepared for a buildable Phase 1 segment of the Corridor. These actions will allow Caltrans to nominate the NCC for Interregional Funding in the 2010 STIP, and obtain CTC approval to program up to \$91M in ITIP funding committed by the Caltrans Director.

The following are the opportunities and constraints for this plan.

Opportunities

1. Delivery of an equivalent project to the original Oakdale Bypass project that is ITIP eligible for the \$91M funding that was unprogrammed from the original project and keep the funds within the region
2. Considerable progress has been made in the areas of environmental and public outreach that would enable completion of the route adoption CEQA document on time.
3. Consensus has been reached among the stakeholders (Cities, County and Caltrans) on future relinquishment of SR 108.

4. The NCC will be a state maintained roadway.

Constraints

1. The route adoption requires a connection to SR 99 and SR 120 that assumes full design standards being met. Caltrans requires that the route adoption address the interchange spacing requirements with respect to Kiernan Ave & Main Street (San Joaquin County) on SR 99 and the proposed interchanges at Pirrone Road and Stoddard Road in the Salida Community Plan area.
2. Though Caltrans will permit constructing the Salida Plan area infrastructure to less than full design standards at this time, it will require a monitoring plan to be put in place with a commitment to address future operational and safety impacts. This commitment will be in the form of providing first priority to mitigate these impacts using the Stanislaus County's share of federal/state/local transportation funding. Caltrans will have the option to require full compliance to design standards when the monitoring plan triggers this requirement.
3. Caltrans requires the route to be built to a full expressway/freeway standard.
4. The overall time constraints to meet the route adoption and interregional designation are tight. The legislative ease in getting the interregional designation is difficult given the current political climate.
5. Adopting the NCC as a state route will require the NCC JPA follow all Caltrans Project Delivery processes thus delaying the construction date.
6. Project delivery costs will be higher as a state route due to the impact to Caltrans resources and the need to follow a more stringent design process and loss of flexibility in design standards. (Note: The state is exercising two-days a month furlough plan that is slated to go for the next 17 months. Caltrans staff will not be available for project meetings or reviews during these days).

Plan B

This plan attempts to resolve all of the constraints identified in Plan A. The intent of this plan is to construct a roadway that strives to meet Caltrans freeway/expressway standards (other than the Freeway-to-Freeway connection to SR 99 and less than standard interchange spacing for Pirrone Road and Stoddard Ave) in hopes of some day transferring the existing SR 108 to the new location and having Caltrans relinquish to the Stanislaus County, the Cities of Modesto, Oakdale and Riverbank, the highway that is being transferred. This plan will propose to apply the \$91M of ITIP funding to the SR 132 West project in exchange for an equal amount of Stanislaus County's Public Facility Fees (PFF) that is currently earmarked for the SR132 project. The NCC will be designed and constructed as a local expressway.

Opportunities

1. All constraints identified in Plan A will be eliminated.
2. SR 132 West is already an interregional route and therefore is ITIP eligible.

3. NCC will be designed and built as a local roadway (but to Caltrans expressway standards for the most part) thus expediting the construction date.
4. The opportunity exists for the NCC roadway to be transferred to Caltrans and designated as SR 108, while existing SR 108 would become a local roadway.
5. Consensus has been reached among the stakeholders (Cities, County and Caltrans) on future relinquishment of SR 108.
6. SR132 West has federal earmark that can be used to leverage the ITIP funding.
7. Caltrans will be involved in an advisory role during the development of NCC, and therefore will not have any surprises/issues when approached to take over the constructed portion as a replacement for existing SR 108.

Constraints

1. Caltrans will have to agree to the transfer of existing SR108 to the NCC and the relinquishment of existing SR108, once a transferable segment of NCC has been built.
2. Obtaining Local Agencies, Caltrans and CTC support to enable the transfer of committed funding from NCC to SR132 West.
3. NCCTEA will need to prepare a CEQA document and a Project Report when it intends to initiate a transfer of SR108 on to the NCC.

Environmental Review Approach

The environmental review process currently underway for Plan A is a two-step process which would not be necessary for the Plan B approach. There are different ways to modify the environmental process to support Plan B. The approaches have been reviewed and a recommended approach is presented here.

Plan A - Environmental Review Approach

The (current) Plan A environmental process was devised to take advantage of potentially available funding sources which emphasized the need for the NCC to be an interregional route. The current approach envisions a two-document strategy. The first document is a CEQA Program EIR for the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to use when considering designating the NCC as an interregional state route. Following this action, the JPA and Caltrans plan to immediately begin preparation of the second document, which is a combined CEQA/NEPA document. This document will continue to be a combined program/project hybrid environmental document and would consist of the following elements:

1. A Corridor-Level EIR for CEQA to enable preservation of the corridor and a Tier 1 EIS for NEPA, and
2. A project-specific EIR/EIS to clear the initial buildable phase for design and construction..

Plan B - Environmental Review Recommended Approach

Under Plan B, the NCC would serve as a local road. As such, the current CEQA-only environmental process (addressing the NCC as an interregional route) would be collapsed to

move immediately into a CEQA/NEPA phase. The project team considered multiple CEQA/NEPA scenarios (attached for consideration) and based upon assessments of these scenarios, the following CEQA/NEPA approach is recommended under Plan B.

The environmental process supporting the Plan B approach would involve preparation of a combined, single CEQA EIR/NEPA EIS document. The CEQA EIR component of the document would be a “hybrid” assessing program-elements and project-specific-elements of the NCC (hence the term “hybrid”). The NEPA EIS component of the document would be project-specific. The benefits of this approach would:

- Result in earlier completion of the environmental process than under the current approach,
- Allow local jurisdictions to amend general plans to include the NCC,
- Qualify the project for future federal funding,
- Define the specific description of the proposed action (e.g., number of lanes, interchange locations, etc.),
- Define the preferred alignment (location) for the route,
- Allow the JPA to implement alignment preservation strategies, and
- Permit the initial construction phase to begin.

The CEQA program level component of the EIR would:

- Allow for protection of right-of-way for future segments and for developers to construct segments as development occurs,
- Address land use and cumulative issues and streamline future project-specific environmental reviews and approvals early in the process,
- Allow for the consideration of corridor wide mitigation programs, and
- Begin to address independent utility of phased development of segments

To begin implementing the approach, the following actions would be taken:

- The Route Adoption CEQA Program EIR would be halted.
- Input from the Route Adoption CEQA Scoping process and environmental technical studies prepared to date would be used to conduct alternatives screening.
- NEPA/CEQA Scoping for the Plan B environmental review would be expedited (as early as March/April 2009). These meetings would use the feedback from the Route Adoption Scoping meetings as supporting project information and more alignment and cross-section information would be provided to NEPA/CEQA Scoping meeting participants.

Because the documents would be combined, the lead agency responsibilities would fall to Caltrans Local Assistance and the JPA in co-lead roles.

Since project funding would be reasonably expected, it is possible the project could be included in the TIP for conformity purposes as a “placeholder” project. Subsequent phases of the project construction would require project level “re-evaluations” of the CEQA and NEPA as in the current approach.

North County Connector Environmental Process Alternative Approaches - Summary

Approach	Initial CEQA	Initial NEPA	Combined CEQA & NEPA Document?	Estimated Total Schedule	Key Features
Current (2-Document Approach)	Program EIR for route adoption (Document #1)	N/A	N/A	1.5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route Adoption 1st • Total 5 year schedule • 2 documents needed • Secures federal fund eligibility • Expedite GP Amendments leading to corridor preservation • Permits initial construction phase
	program/phase-1 project-specific EIR (Document #2)	Tiered/phase-1 project-specific EIS	Yes	2.5 (5 years total for both documents)	
Plan B (Separate CEQA and NEPA Documents)	program/phase-1 project-specific EIR	Phase-1 Project-Specific EIS	No	3.5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route Adoption halted • Separate CEQA and NEPA Documents • Secures federal fund eligibility • Expedite GP Amendments leading to corridor preservation • Expedites initial construction phase

**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Adoption of 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program**

Resolution No. G-08-08

- 1.1 WHEREAS Government Code Section 14529 requires the California Transportation Commission biennially to adopt and submit to the Legislature and Governor a state transportation improvement program (STIP), and
- 1.2 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 14529, the 2008 STIP is a five-year STIP, adding two new program years, 2011-12, and 2012-13, and
- 1.3 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 14525, the Commission adopted the 2008 STIP fund estimate on October 24, 2007, and
- 1.4 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 14530.1, the Commission adopted amendments to the STIP guidelines, to be applicable to the 2008 STIP development process, on October 24, 2007, and
- 1.5 WHEREAS the 2008 STIP fund estimate provided \$1.164 billion in new STIP programming capacity, and
- 1.6 WHEREAS the \$1.164 billion in new capacity includes \$144 million that is restricted to projects eligible for funding from federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds, and
- 1.7 WHEREAS the fund estimate included Public Transportation Account funding, which is restricted to rail and transit projects, at a level that is \$14 million less than the amount required to fund all rail and transit projects that were programmed in the 2006 STIP, as amended, and
- 1.8 WHEREAS the statutes define the STIP as a resource management document to assist the state and local entities to plan and implement transportation improvements and to utilize resources in a cost effective manner, and
- 1.9 WHEREAS the statutes make 75% of all new STIP funds available for the regional improvement program, subdivided by formula into county shares, with projects to be nominated by each regional agency in its regional transportation improvement program (RTIP), and
- 1.10 WHEREAS the statutes make the remaining 25% of all new STIP funds available for the interregional improvement program, with projects to be nominated by the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in its interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP) or, under limited circumstances, by a regional agency in its RTIP, and
- 1.11 WHEREAS the Commission has received and reviewed the 2008 RTIPs and the 2008 ITIP submitted on or about February 19, 2008, as well as various amendments and corrections submitted subsequently, and
- 1.12 WHEREAS the Commission has received requests for changes to the STIP funding of projects also funded from the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) and the Route 99 Bond program, including requests that would increase STIP funding by \$93 million, and

- 1.13 WHEREAS the Commission has had insufficient time for review of amendments to the project baseline agreements for the CMIA and Route 99 Bond projects, and
- 1.14 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 14529, the Commission held two public hearings, one in Los Angeles on March 12, 2008, and the other in Sacramento on March 18, 2008, for the purpose of reconciling any objections by any county or regional agency to the ITIP or the Department's objections to any RTIP, and has considered the testimony heard at those hearings along with further written and oral comments, and
- 1.15 WHEREAS the total amount programmed in each fiscal year may not exceed the amount specified in the adopted fund estimate, and
- 1.16 WHEREAS the Commission staff recommendations for the 2008 STIP were published and made available to the Commission, the Department, regional transportation agencies, and county transportation commissions on May 9, 2008, and
- 1.17 WHEREAS the staff recommendations conform to the fund estimate and other requirements of statute for the STIP, and
- 1.18 WHEREAS the staff recommendations include rail and transit projects at a level that does not exceed the fund estimate capacity for the Public Transportation Account, and
- 1.19 WHEREAS the Route 210 freeway in San Bernardino County between the Los Angeles County Line and Route 215 (PPNO 193S) was programmed in the STIP for \$98 million for right-of-way and was constructed with local funds, and the Commission has not been able to close out the project for STIP share purposes because the Department has not yet reported a final estimate of right-of-way costs for the project,
- 2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission hereby adopts the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to include the program described in the staff recommendations, including the attachments to this resolution, and
- 2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, except as otherwise noted in the staff recommendations or this resolution, the 2008 STIP includes all projects remaining from the 2006 STIP, as currently amended, for which funding has not yet been allocated, and
- 2.3 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that each of the local road and transit rehabilitation projects included in the staff recommendations or remaining from the prior STIP is included in the 2008 STIP, subject to verification by the Department at the time of allocation by the Commission that the project meets the standard for rehabilitation and does not include ineligible maintenance costs, and
- 2.4 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that each of the projects identified in the staff recommendations as eligible for Transportation Enhancement (TE) funding is included in the 2008 STIP subject to verification by the Department and the Federal Highway Administration that the project is indeed eligible for TE funding, and
- 2.5 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends that all STIP projects that are eligible or could be made eligible for Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds shall be funded from the state's Federal TE apportionment, whether or not they are identified in the staff recommendations as TE-eligible and whether or not they are designated for programming from TE funding, and
- 2.6 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends that all STIP rail and transit projects, including grade separations on passenger rail lines, be funded from the Public Transportation Account or, if eligible, from the state's Federal TE apportionment, and

- 2.7 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends that State Highway Account funds, including federal funds other than federal TE funds, be reserved for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and not be used for the STIP during the 2008 STIP period, except for the payment of outstanding GARVEE bond debt service, and
- 2.8 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, while the Commission is deleting all programming for the Route 120 Oakdale Bypass in the 2008 STIP, as proposed in the ITIP, the Commission supports the Department's commitment to the development and delivery of the North County Corridor (NCC) project identified by the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) as an alternative to the Route 120 Oakdale Bypass, and the Commission acknowledges the Department's intent to nominate up to \$91 million in the 2010 ITIP for programming of an ITIP-eligible project segment, and
- 2.9 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission recognizes StanCOG's commitment to the NCC project through the programming of the environmental component of the project in the 2008 STIP, and the Commission expects the Department and StanCOG to identify an appropriate scope, cost, and schedule for programming of a project segment in the 2010 STIP, and
- 2.10 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission expects the Department, in consultation with the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) to report its final estimate of right-of-way costs for the Route 210 freeway well in advance of the fund estimate for the 2010 STIP, so that any impact of these costs on the San Bernardino county share can be taken into account beginning with the 2010 STIP, and
- 2.11 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, as recommended by staff, the Commission is leaving \$93 million in STIP capacity as an unprogrammed reserve pending the review and approval of amendments to the project baseline agreements for CMIA and Route 99 Bond projects and that the Commission intends to act on the STIP requests for those projects at the June 25-26, 2008 meeting, and
- 2.12 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Commission staff, in consultation with the Department and regional agencies, is authorized to make further technical changes in cost, schedules, and descriptions for projects in the 2008 STIP, consistent with the fund estimate, in order to reflect the most current information (including the lapse of projects at the close of the 2007-08 fiscal year) or to clarify the Commission's programming commitments, with report of any substantive changes back to the Commission for approval at the June 25-26, 2008 meeting, and
- 2.13 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission adopts this STIP in accordance with current law and the fund estimate, which is based on current law, and that the capacity of the Commission to allocate funding to STIP projects is dependent on revenues that are appropriated through the annual state budget, and
- 2.14 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that **if the revenues made available through the state budget fall short of the amounts assumed in the fund estimate, which is based on current law, then the Commission may be required to delay or restrict allocations and would adopt interim allocation plans to do so.**

ATTACHMENT A
2008 STIP STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
ERRATA

(All costs listed in \$1,000's)

County Share Summaries:

- Alameda. For the Route 238 landscape replacement (#96G), construction is \$3,200, not \$4,059, and the totals are corrected accordingly. \$4,059 is the total for all components.
- Mono. For the Route 395 Highpoint curve correction (#241), the first of two lines is -\$1,241, not +\$1,241, and the totals are corrected accordingly.
- Monterey. For the County's Davis Rd Salinas River Bridge, the construction component amount is \$1,600, not -\$1,600. The fiscal year amount was listed correctly and totals do not change.

Interregional Share Summary:

- Interregional TE. For the Route 395 Independence lighting (#454), the first of two lines is -\$263, not -\$219. Construction support was incorrectly listed, and the totals are corrected accordingly.

ATTACHMENT B
2008 STIP STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
LATE CHANGES AND CLARIFICATIONS

(All costs listed in \$1,000's)

- Alameda. For the Route 880 Mission Blvd interchange reconstruction (#16V), change the implementing agency from Caltrans to ACTIA and change \$10,000 construction from 2008-09 to 2009-10.
- Contra Costa. The request for \$3,339 in increased STIP funding for the I-80 integrated corridor mobility CMA project (#62E) is withdrawn.
- Contra Costa (TE). For Hercules intercity rail station enhancement (#2011F), change \$1,097 construction from 2008-09 to 2010-11. For Montalvin Manor pedestrian improvements (#183K), change \$365 in 2008-09 to \$30 PS&E and \$335 construction.
- El Dorado (TE). For Placerville El Dorado Trail (#1215), advance the project by one year, with \$40 environmental and \$45 PS&E in 2010-11 and \$95 construction in 2011-12. For El Dorado County, El Dorado Hills SMUD Corridor bike path (#1216), advance the project by one year, with \$15 environmental and \$29 PS&E in 2010-11 and \$251 construction in 2011-12.
- Humboldt. For the Route 101 Eureka-Arcata corridor improvement (#72), change \$3,262 environmental to \$2,613 and \$2,718 PS&E to \$2,496. This restores both components to the amounts programmed in the prior STIP.
- Los Angeles. For the Route 5 Carmenita Road interchange (#2808A), change \$44,231 (\$35,531 construction and \$8,700 construction support) from 2008-09 to 2009-10.
- Los Angeles. For the Route 71 Mission Blvd interchange (Caltrans portion) (#2232), change the closeout cost for environmental from \$400 to \$200.
- Los Angeles (TE). For the City of Los Angeles San Fernando Road bike path (#4085), change \$8,370 construction from 2012-13 to 2011-12.
- Marin. For the Route 101 San Antonio Rd curve correction (#360G), change \$2,300 PS&E (\$1,900 RIP and \$400 IIP) from 2010-11 to 2008-09.
- Mono. Delete the Owens River Road project (#2020), which is now programmed in 2008-09 for \$2,255 construction. Change PPM (#2003) in each year from 2008-09 through 2010-11 from \$400 to \$350. Change the County's Bridgeport local street rehab (#2021) construction from \$2,621 in 2010-11 to \$1,999 in 2010. Change the County's Lee Vining streets rehab (#2558) construction from \$2,815 to \$2,047 in 2010-11. Change the County's Owens Gorge Road rehab (#2012) construction from \$1,791 to \$1,619 in 2009-10. Add the County's June Lake street rehab (#2561), with \$37 environmental in 2010-11, \$242 PS&E in 2011-12, \$60 R/W in 2011-12, and \$3,005 construction in 2012-13. Add the County's Chalfant street rehab (#2563), with \$35 environmental in 2010-11, \$30 PS&E in 2010-11, and \$1,219 construction in 2012-13.
- Mono (TE). For Mammoth Lakes, Mammoth Scenic Loop bike lanes (#2565), change \$1,000 construction from 2012-13 to 2011-12.
- Nevada. For the Route 20 Dorsey Drive interchange (#3976), change PS&E from \$1,390 to \$655 and change construction in 2009-10 from \$9,820 to \$10,555.
- Orange. For the Fullerton transportation center parking (#2026), change \$29,219 construction from 2012-13 to 2010-11. For Tustin rail station parking expansion (#9510), change \$16,500 construction from 2010-11 to 2011-12. For Placentia Metrolink station with siding (#9514), change \$16,600 construction from 2009-10 to 2012-13.

- Sacramento. For the Sacramento Regional Transit South Line extension (#3L05), change \$4,307 PS&E from 2010-11 to 2009-10.
- Sacramento (TE). For R Street enhancements (#1662), change \$4,665 construction from 2011-12 to 2010-11.
- San Benito (TE). For San Benito COG, San Juan Highway bike lanes (#9380), change \$252 construction from 2012-13 to 2011-12.
- San Francisco. For the Golden Gate Bridge median barrier (#2014U), delete \$970 environmental in 2009-10, \$80 R/W in 2009-10, and \$2,900 PS&E in 2010-11, and increase construction in 2011-12 from \$3,950 to \$8,000.
- San Francisco (TE). For Leland Avenue streetscape (#9098A), change \$1,735 construction from 2010-11 to 2008-09.
- San Joaquin (TE). For Stockton, Airport Way streetscape (#205), change \$900 construction from 2012-13 to 2011-12. For San Joaquin Regional Transit District, Airport Way bus rapid transit corridor enhancement (#204), change \$124 construction from 2012-13 to 2011-12.
- San Luis Obispo. For the County's Price Canyon Rd widening (#2071), change \$3,414 construction from 2008-09 to 2009-10.
- San Luis Obispo (TE). For the Arroyo Grande East Branch St streetscape (#2218), change \$838 construction from 2011-12 to 2009-10. For the Pismo Beach Promenade IV (#1109), change \$400 construction from 2011-12 to 2009-10. For the Atascadero Traffic Way streetscape (#1898A), change \$375 construction from 2012-13 to 2011-12. For the Grover Beach Grand Av streetscape (#2219), change \$475 construction from 2012-13 to 2011-12. For the County's Bob Jones bike and pedestrian pathway (#1129), split the project (originally recommended for \$1,600 construction in 2009-10) into two phases, with phase 1 construction for \$1,000 in 2009-10 and phase 2 construction for \$600 in 2012-13. For the County's Atascadero-Templeton connector (#1843), delete \$150 originally recommended for environmental in 2008-09 and change PS&E from \$150 in 2009-10 to \$200 in 2012-13. For the County's Morro Bay-Cayucos connector, delete \$150 originally recommended for environmental in 2008-09 and change PS&E from \$150 in 2009-10 to \$200 in 2012-13. For the TE reserve, change \$800 in 2012-13 to \$450 in 2011-12 and \$350 in 2012-13.
- San Mateo. For the Route 101 Willow Road interchange reconstruction (#690A), reduce STIP funding for construction in 2011-12 by \$2,079, from \$18,870 to \$16,791, with the difference to come from local funding.
- San Mateo. The request for \$4,606 in increased STIP funding for the Route 101 auxiliary lanes CMIA project (#658B) is withdrawn.
- San Mateo. Add San Mateo C/CAG Smart Corridors ITS (#2140F) for \$1,860 PS&E in 2008-09, \$140 R/W in 2008-09, and \$8,000 construction in 2010-11.
- San Mateo (TE). Change the TE reserve (#2140C) in 2008-09 from \$1,836 to \$1,124, in 2009-10 from \$1,313 to \$1,587, and in 2010-11 from \$1,278 to \$1,716.
- Santa Barbara. For the Route 101 improvement, Carpenteria Creek to Linden (#482), change \$39,589 construction from 2010-11 to 2011-12. For the Route 166 widening, Guadalupe-Santa Maria (#620), change the implementing agency from Caltrans to the Santa Barbara Association of Governments (SBCAG) and change the funding for environmental in 2011-12 from \$3,100 to \$1,251. For the Route 101 Union Valley Parkway interchange (#4638), change \$5,050 construction and \$1,800 construction support from 2011-12 to 2010-11. Add the County's Ortega Hill Road improvement (#1206A) for \$2,000 construction in 2010-11; this project was proposed in the RTIP for 2008-09 and was not included in the original staff recommendation.

- Santa Barbara (TE). For the City of Santa Barbara's Loma Alta Hill sidewalk (#1195), change \$1542 construction from 2011-12 to 2008-09. For the Lompoc Alan Hancock bike path (#1906), change \$905 construction from 2011-12 to 2010-11.
- Santa Cruz. For the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Route 1 HOV environmental study (#73), change \$1,375 from 2011-12 to 2008-09.
- Shasta. For the Route 5 South Redding widening (#3331), change \$1,195 environmental from 2011-12 to 2008-09.
- Solano. For the Solano TA local roads north of Route 80/680/12 (#5301K), change \$11,412 construction from 2008-09 to 2009-10.
- Stanislaus. For the StanCOG North County Corridor environmental study (#228), change \$6,200 from 2011-12 to 2008-09.
- Trinity. For Brady Rd intersection realignment (#2420), change \$35 PS&E from 2008-09 to 2009-10 and change \$35 R/W and \$400 construction from 2009-10 to 2010-11.
- Trinity (TE). For the Lowden Park-Senior Center bike and pedestrian lane (#2487), change \$130 environmental from 2010-11 to 2008-09, \$40 R/W from 2012-13 to 2009-10, and \$770 construction from 2012-13 to 2010-11. This TE project is to be constructed in conjunction with the East Weaverville road project (#2138). For the Horsewater Lake pedestrian bridge (#2399C), change \$25 PS&E from 2008-09 to 2009-10 and \$60 R/W and \$130 construction from 2009-10 to 2010-11.
- Tulare. For the Route 216 widening (#106), change the limits to Lovers Lane to McAuliff Street. For the County's Road 80 expressway, phase 1 (#6L11), change the limits to Avenue 304 to Avenue 328. For the Route 65 project to align and widen Road 204 (#104), change environmental programmed in the prior year from \$3,807 to \$3,150.
- Intercity Rail. For Orange County Fullerton station parking expansion (#2026) change \$2,750 construction from 2012-13 to 2010-11.
- Intercity Rail. Add Stockton station relocation (#2081), as recommended in the ITIP, for \$100 environmental in 2011-12, \$650 PS&E in 2012-13, and \$2,750 R/W in 2012-13.
- Interregional Program (Highways). For the Monterey Route 101 Prunedale improvement (#58G), reduce R/W from \$56,073 to \$42,401 and increase construction in 2010-11 from \$74,664 to \$88,336. This compensates for an advance of federal earmark funds.
- Interregional Program (TE). For the Aesthetic Enhancements along Route 5 in Los Angeles County (#2808A), change \$3,385 (\$3,195 construction and \$190 construction support) from 2008-09 to 2009-10.
- Interregional Program (TE). For the Merced County Route 99 corridor bridge enhancement (#196), change environmental in 2010-11 from \$17 to \$81, PS&E in 2011-12 from \$65 to \$100, and construction in 2012-13 from \$829 to \$900.
- Interregional Program (TE). For the Riverside County Route 91 Green River Road landscape enhancements (#72G), change \$1,000 construction and \$536 construction support in 2008-09 to \$1,103 construction and \$536 construction support in 2010-11.
- Interregional Program (TE). For the Route 46 Whitley 1 enhancements in San Luis Obispo County (#A226C), change \$4,500 construction from 2011-12 to 2009-10.
- Interregional Program (TE). For the Stanislaus County Route 99 corridor bridge enhancement (#195), change environmental in 2010-11 from \$29 to \$96, PS&E in 2011-12 from \$105 to \$474, construction in 2012-13 from \$1,387 to \$1,075, and construction support in 2012-13 from \$236 to \$509.

- Interregional Program (TE). For the following projects, change construction and construction support from 2010-11 to 2009-10, as originally proposed:
 - Los Angeles, Route 5, landscape enhancements (#3547), \$2,356.
 - San Bernardino, Route 71, tree planting (#234P), \$1,781.
 - San Joaquin, Route 205, tree planting (#1), \$1,764.
- Interregional Program (TE). For the following projects, change construction and construction support from 2011-12 to 2010-11, as originally proposed:
 - Lake, Route 20, Bloody Island interpretive center (#4421), \$192.
 - Placer, Route 89, Alice Richardson water pollution abatement (#5282), \$574.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

1120 N STREET

P. O. BOX 942873

SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001

PHONE (916) 654-5266

FAX (916) 654-6608

TTY 711

*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

February 19, 2008

Mr. Jeff Grover, Supervisor
County of Stanislaus – District 3
1010 10th Street, Suite 6500
Modesto, CA 95354

The Honorable Ferrell Jackson
Mayor of City of Oakdale
280 North Third Avenue
Oakdale, CA 95361

Dear Supervisor Grover and Mayor Jackson:

It was a pleasure to meet with you and others on February 15, 2008, to discuss the Oakdale Bypass and the plans for the North County Corridor project.

The California Department of Transportation (Department) previously committed \$91 million of Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds to the Oakdale Bypass project in 2004. Since that time, traffic patterns in Stanislaus County have changed and the region has indicated that an alternative project may better serve the county's needs. Under the authority of the resolution approving the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation last June, the California Transportation Commission redirected \$22,169,000 of ITIP funds from the Oakdale Bypass project with the proviso that funding would be restored when a viable replacement project was identified by the region. The Department understands the proposed North County Corridor project is being developed as a replacement for the Oakdale Bypass project. As we discussed, this project is in the early stages of development, and it would be premature to fund it in the 2008 STIP cycle.

The Department, however, remains committed to working with the region on a corridor solution, and intends to commit ITIP funds in the 2010 STIP cycle for up to \$91 million in capital money for an ITIP-eligible North County Corridor project segment. The Department fully supports the formation of a corridor joint powers authority to implement this work, and appreciates your efforts to secure a countywide sales tax measure or other funding source to fully fund this project. In addition, we understand that we also need to resolve the issue of the payment of support costs, and look forward to working with you to reach a resolution on this matter.



Supervisor Grover and Mayor Jackson
February 19, 2008
Page 2

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Kome Ajise, District 10 Director, at (209) 948-7973.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Will Kempton". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

WILL KEMPTON
Director

- c: John Chalker, Chairman, California Transportation Commission
- Kirk Lindsey, Commissioner, California Transportation Commission
- John Barna, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission
- Vince Harris, Executive Director, Stanislaus Council of Governments
- Jim Niskanen, Acting City Manager, City of Modesto
- Steven Hallam, City Manager, City of Oakdale
- Kome Ajise, District 10 Director, Department of Transportation
- Cindy McKim, Chief Financial Officer, Department of Transportation